WORKERS' INTERNATIONAL
BOOK STORE
1313 E. FIRESTONE BLVD.
LOS ANGELES, CALIF. 90001
U. S. A.

RESULTS OF KHRUSHCHEV'S VISIT TO YUGOSLAVIA

THE "NAIM FRASHERI"
STATE PUBLISHING ENTERPRISE
TIRANA

RESULTS OF KHRUSHCHEV'S VISIT TO YUGOSLAVIA

Article published in the newspaper
Zëri i Popullit

September 13, 1963

THE "NAIM FRASHERI"
STATE PUBLISHING ENTERPRISE
TIRANA 1964

A few days ago Khrushchev concluded his visit to Yugoslavia. Both the propaganda machine of the revisionists and the Western press tried to give this visit as much "international political significance" as possible. It is now clear to all that Khrushchev did not go to Yugoslavia for a vacation as stated at first. He went there to complete the process of fully rehabilitating the Tito clique, openly to join with this band of traitors long condemned by all the Communist and Workers' Parties, to hatch new plots against the socialist camp, the international communist movement and peace, and to take another step in his rapprochement with the U.S. imperialists.

These aims of Khrushchev's on this visit are quite obvious from his blatant and unsparing statements about the "successful building of socialism in Yugoslavia", about "the correct Marxist-Leninist line of action and the brilliant merits of the present Yugoslav leaders" headed by his "friend and comrade Tito", about the contribution of the

Tito clique to "the development of the principles of peaceful coexistence", "the consolidation of the unity of the communist and workers' movement" and "the creative development of Marxism-Leninism", about the contribution of the Yugoslav leaders to the "consolidation of the anti-imperialist front", about "the superiority of the Yugoslav road to socialism" and particularly about the "workers' self-government" which, it is claimed, deserves special attention and study by other socialist countries, in order to copy it and about "the great role which Yugoslavia should play in the Balkans", and so on.

Tito, on his part, pointed out that certain differences of views which still exist are losing their significance in the face of their great common goals. He expressed his satisfaction at Khrushchev's high appraisal of his own activity, struggle for "socialism", and spreading of "communist" ideas and spirit in Yugoslavia. He expressed delight at the anti-Marxist, anti-socialist attacks which Khrushchev has launched against the communist movement, the Communist Party of China, the Party of Labour of Albania and other Marxist-Leninist parties.

* * *

The first main conclusion to draw from Khrushchev's visit is that, by rehabilitating the Tito clique completely and joining with it, the Moscow revisionist group has plunged itself deeper into the camp of the enemies of Marxism-Leninism, of socialism and peace, and farther into the mire of betrayal.

In his August 24 speech at Split, Khrushchev publicly declared, "We note with pleasure that the views of the USSR and Yugoslavia are similar on most international issues. The unity of views and actions of the USSR and Yugoslavia on international matters is a factor of paramount importance to world politics. This unity contributes to the development of the principle of peaceful coexistence in relations among all states." This and many other statements of this kind not only show a complete unity of views between Khrushchev and Tito on matters of foreign policy but they also demonstrate that Khrushchev has made Tito his equal partner in directing world politics. But what role has Khrushchev assigned to his other partners? Apparently, like puppets, they are to blindly follow "the Yugoslav lead" of the revisionist caravan.

In the field of ideology Khrushchev himself has admitted on more than one occasion that complete unity has been achieved on fundamental matters. "For us Soviet Communists," he stressed, "there can be no basic contradictions with the Yugoslav Communists." And to the foreign journalists he said at Brioni on August 28, "We have the same ideas and are guided by the same theory."

There is no need for a guide to a village already in sight. It is now clear to the whole world and there is no special need to publicly acknowledge that Tito and Khrushchev are inspired by the same deep-seated revisionist ideas which have always inspired renegades from Marxism-Leninism and that in their practical splitting and anti-Marxist activity they are guided by the same objectives, which are to quell the revolutionary spirit of the international communist movement, to liquidate socialism and re-establish the rule of imperialism.

In addition to their unity of viewpoints and activities in the fields of politics and ideology, Khrushchev has laid the basis for closer collaboration with the Tito clique in the economic field. The purpose is clear.

Side by side with the imperialists, he wants to make a contribution to the maintenance of this clique and keep it on its feet, not only through all-round political and ideological support but also through unlimited economic aid, in order to make Yugoslavia a show-window of revisionist "socialism". At Rakovica Khrushchev stated, "Good economic relations are also being established between our countries. Compared with 1955, the volume of trade turn-over between our countries has risen nearly six times. In 1963 the exchange of goods is 50 per cent greater than it was last year."

Tito, on his part, confirmed in Velenja on August 30, "It is to the interest of both sides that we should increase and further develop our good relations. And we shall do this. We have, for instance, already reached an agreement to cooperate in certain branches of economy, which will expand through further collaboration." Yugoslavia has consented to participate in the "socialist division of labour". It was finally accorded the post of observer in the Council of Economic Mutual Aid. Tito, of course, has every reason to be satisfied with all this; he is like a horse which feeds in two or more

mangers. This gives him a better chance to undermine the socialist camp.

During his sojourn in Yugoslavia, Khrushchev also revealed his determination to uphold the revisionist course of the Belgrade clique and, true enough, this admission made a great hit in, and was enthusiastically welcomed by, the Western press. Khrushchev revealed himself as a supporter of the Yugoslav road to socialism. In order to do this, he did not even hesitate to oppose the Soviet Union's path of building socialism and communism, to openly criticize Soviet methods of economic management, and to eulogize the Yugoslav system of self-government. There are no bounds to betrayal! This is how the Tanjug news agency describes Khrushchev's encounter with the managers of the Rakovica combine in the neighbourhood of Belgrade:

> Stressing that in the Soviet Union they stick to the principle of a "single chief", Khrushchev said that he likes the form of workers' councils and that this form is progressive. "We, in our country," Khrushchev continued, "are seeking new forms of management, in which the people can fully express their own will and,

therefore, we are interested in your experience." He emphasized again that the experience of Yugoslavia may be valuable to the self-government of Yugoslav workers. A study should be made of things which time has already confirmed. In connection with this, Khrushchev added that he would most certainly send a group of functionaries of the Party, trade unions and economic organs to study in detail these matters of Yugoslav experience.

What is readily apparent is the fact that through its detailed reports and information, the Yugoslav press shed light upon Khrushchev's opinions and remarks which he uttered at his meeting with the managers of the Rakovica combine especially on his high appraisal of the "self-government" and "workers' councils" which, as everybody knows, far from being "progressive forms", are links leading to the restoration of capitalism in the Yugoslav economy. But while the Yugoslav and Western press were making a great noise about these utterances of Khrushchev's, the Soviet press, which specializes in extolling his "sagacity" and in letting no chance go by without singing

praises to his "wit" and "resourcefulness", was surprisingly mute on that day. It published not a word of this interview. Apparently, the Moscow revisionists do not feel certain and dare not come out openly before their own people and praise the revisionist forms of economic management which have nothing in common with socialism and which they themselves not long ago criticized and rejected as anti-Marxist and anti-socialist and as a variant theory of anarcho-syndicalism.

It was precisely the present two secretaries of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, B. Ponomaryov and J. Andropov, who in their article "In the Positions of the Old Revisionists" published in the Soviet journal *Komunist,* No. 8, 1960, defined Yugoslav socialism as one which "would please both the Right-wing social-democrats and the bourgeois nationalists and the bourgeoisie as a whole", and ridiculed Tito's statement at the 5th Congress of the Socialist Alliance of the Working People of Yugoslavia that "the other socialist countries would like to see the results of the Yugoslav road in their own practice". They stressed at that time

that "socialism can triumph in Yugoslavia only if revisionism is vanquished" and that "the Yugoslav working people cannot be convinced of the story about the false superiority of the Yugoslav road". "Now," they pointed out, "Comrade N. S. Khrushchev's warning from the rostrum of the 21st Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on the eventual consequences of the so-called Yugoslav road of development, which might lead to the loss of socialist achievements of the Yugoslav people, resound with ever greater force."

But how fast times change! Today the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Khrushchev, personally expresses his wish "to see the results of the Yugoslav road in practice in the Soviet Union". This fact very effectively shows who is drawing nearer to whom, Khrushchev to Tito, or Tito to Khrushchev. Facts give the most exact answer.

Having secured Khrushchev's approval, Tito proclaimed once more the superiority of the Yugoslav road to socialism and stressed that it was no longer specific to Yugoslavia alone but should be inserted into

the basic work of every party in the socialist countries. And the first successes have been manifested, Tito claims, in the Soviet Union during these last ten years. His exact words are: "When speaking of the self-government of workers reference is not made to the problems and needs of a specific country alone. Social self-government is one of the basic ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin. That is why Comrade Nikita Sergeyevitch Khrushchev attaches great importance to this matter. When we visited the Soviet Union we had opportunity to be convinced that extraordinary progress has been achieved there during these last ten years."

Western observers took great pains to cover up their enthusiasm when Khrushchev approved of the Yugoslav-type of "socialism". They saw in Yugoslavia "a Khrushchev prepared to make many concessions and take many steps ahead". They have long looked on Yugoslavia as "a conveyer-belt" to carry the counter-revolutionary ideas of the West to the East. This is how the London Radio expressed it on August 30:

> Many observers consider Khrushchev's interest in the "workers' councils" in Yugoslavia as the most important result

of his visit to the Adriatic seacoast. These councils are nothing else but a symbol of Titoite communism, which constitute one of the main characteristics of revisionism, which the Soviet Union and the entire communist world officially condemned less than three years ago. The system of workers' councils in Yugoslavia is half communist and half western. The only danger lies in its eventual falling between the two chairs. This system based on two patterns is still holding its own. That's why Khrushchev is eager to do something similar in Russia. And if he does this he will not only acclaim Tito but will also endorse the western economic system.

The mouthpiece of the big American monopolists, the *New York Times,* wrote:

The most interesting aspect . . . is the very friendly attitude of the Soviet Premier, Khrushchev, towards the Yugoslav system of carrying out orthodox communism. This may give rise to big changes in Moscow's economic organization. Yugoslavia has adopted a large number of ideas

from the West, which enables it to play the role of a conveyer-belt to carry western economic ideas to the East.

Under these circumstances, is there any reason for the imperialist West to have the least worry about the results of Khrushchev's visit to Yugoslavia? None whatsoever.

Khrushchev cannot deceive the Soviet people, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the other Communist and Workers' Parties for long by means of demagogy and with his legend that changes have been made in Yugoslavia towards socialism, that the Yugoslav leaders are correcting their former mistakes, and that Yugoslavia is consequently a country "which is building socialism".

Everybody knows how matters really stand, what "changes" have been made there. Day-to-day experience brings out many facts which go to prove that nothing has changed in Tito's Yugoslavia. Only the grave can straighten a hunchback. Tito himself has often stated that he has discarded nothing from his programme, that "there is no question of any concession" and that he has made no change and intends to make no change whatsoever.

He repeated this once again to Khrushchev's very face. Reassuring his friends in the West publicly, Tito said, "In connection with the visit [of Khrushchev] rumours are already being spread in the West, conjecturing as to who will make concessions. 'Will Tito and the Yugoslav Communists enter the camp or will N. S. Khrushchev make concessions to the Yugoslav Communists on behalf of the Communists of the Soviet Union?' " "This is altogether out of the question," Tito emphasized, "there is no question of any concessions, this matter will not be taken up in the talks." (*Pravda,* August 23.)

A good listener needs only a word. Tito's statements are true as far as he is concerned. Facts show that Tito has made no concessions to Khrushchev, but Khrushchev has made many concessions to Tito. The *Washington Post,* which stands very close to the U.S. Government and especially to the State Department, expressed the idea on August 24 that at the present state of international affairs, especially in the Sino-Soviet conflict, "Khrushchev stands in greater need of Tito than Tito of Khrushchev. Premier Khrushchev is again currying favor with the Yugoslav leader."

Khrushchev's demagogical utterances about the Tito clique having changed and corrected its mistakes aim at proving that Yugoslavia is a real socialist country and that socialism is being built there successfully, so that he may justify his full collaboration with the Tito clique, its final rehabilitation and the inclusion of Yugoslavia in the family of socialist countries and of the League of Yugoslav Communists in the ranks of the international communist movement. But this is one of the most crude and open violations of the 1960 Moscow Statement unanimously approved by all fraternal Parties, in which the Yugoslav revisionists are branded as renegades from Marxism-Leninism and as agents of imperialism, as splitters and underminers of the socialist camp, the international communist movement and the peace-loving forces and states.

But the achievement of full unity with the Tito clique shows clearly once again along which path the Khrushchev group is hastily proceeding. As the popular saying goes, "You judge a man by the friends he keeps." To unite with the Yugoslav revisionists means to unite with the enemies of socialism, renegades from Marxism-Leninism,

the splitters of unity and the agents of imperialism who plot against the socialist countries and the entire world revolutionary movement. The Khrushchev group has not only united with the treacherous Tito clique but has launched frenzied attacks on all those Communist Parties which loyally abide by the Moscow Statement of the 81 Communist and Workers' Parties, carry out their international duty and expose the Yugoslav leaders with their revisionist ideas and anti-socialist activities. This means that the Khrushchev group has obliterated all distinctions between friend and foe, between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism, between champions and splitters of unity and between anti-imperialist fighters and agents of imperialism, and has plunged itself from head to foot into the camp of the enemies of Marxism-Leninism, of socialism, of the peoples and peace in the world.

* * *

The second main conclusion drawn from Khrushchev's visit to the Tito clique, from the public utterances and statements of both, is that they have coordinated their dangerous undermining activities against the social-

ist camp and the international communist movement, first and foremost against the Marxist-Leninist parties which are struggling, firmly and in a principled manner, against modern revisionism and in defence of the purity of Marxism-Leninism. This is clearly borne out by a series of incontestable facts.

It is now no secret to anyone that Khrushchev and his propaganda agents have for some time ceased to use the term "socialist camp". This was especially noticeable during his stay in Yugoslavia. In no address, in absolutely no speech or record of discussion appearing in print can one find an expression of this kind except at the August 21 banquet when Tito referred to it in a disdainful way. The question here is not merely one of expediency for Khrushchev in an effort to evade all that might prejudice his "cordial relations" with the renegade Tito, the use of such "obsolete" and "unnecessary" terms like "the socialist camp", towards which everybody knows the Yugoslav revisionists maintain a completely negative and hostile attitude. The fact is that Khrushchev upholds and is fully at one with Tito's hostile attitude towards the

socialist camp. When a foreign journalist asked him at Brioni whether "the fact that Yugoslavia is a non-aligned country will be in the way of Soviet-Yugoslav cooperation", Khrushchev answered, "No!" and added, "Historically all the socialist countries share the same Marxist-Leninist position, for we are bound by common ideas and are guided by one single theory. While expressions like 'blocs' and so on are 'temporary phenomena'."

What does this mean? What blocs does he refer to? It is publicly known that the Yugoslav revisionists consider the socialist camp as a "bloc", that when they speak about the so-called "neutrality" or "non-alignment" of Yugoslavia, they pretend that not only they stand aloof from blocs and military organizations but they stand outside and above camps. Under these circumstances Khrushchev's statement against the so-called "blocs" gives rise to two inevitable conclusions:

First, Khrushchev agrees in full with Tito's reactionary position, regarding the socialist camp as "a military bloc", and a negative phenomenon that has led to the aggravation of the international situation

and as something "temporary". This is a hostile attitude which aims at liquidating the great socialist camp, the main historical achievement of the world revolutionary movement.

Secondly, in this way Khrushchev upholds and legalizes the demagogic manoeuvres of the Tito clique on the so-called "neutrality" and "non-alignment" of Yugoslavia. But how can there be a socialist country which is "neutral" in the great historical struggle between the two camps, the socialist and imperialist camps? There was a time when Khrushchev himself unmasked and rejected this absurd pretension of the Tito clique. "The Yugoslav leaders," he declared at the 21st Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, "claim that they stand outside all blocs, above the camps. Yet in point of fact they are in the Balkan bloc, which consists of Yugoslavia, Turkey and Greece. . . . The leaders of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia resent our telling them that they are sitting on two chairs. They insist that they are sitting on their own Yugoslav chair. But for some reason this Yugoslav chair is held up by the American monopolies! And it is precisely

for this reason that this 'non-bloc' position of the leaders of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia and the neutrality they extol so highly smell heavily of the American monopolies, which nourish 'Yugoslav socialism'. The history of the class struggle knows of no case when the bourgeoisie materially or morally supported its class enemy. assisted it to build socialism."

Thus, Khrushchev has now decided to strike out the socialist camp and has not hesitated to come out into the open about it. This is not only a big concession of principle to Tito's revisionist and anti-socialist position but also a real betrayal of the vital interests of socialism and an attempt to undermine the socialist camp itself and to liquidate it.

To facilitate his activities to undermine and split the socialist camp, the international communist movement and their unity based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, Khrushchev deemed it necessary to revive the idea of pan-Slavism during his visit to Yugoslavia. Right at the start he spoke of "our traditional friendship", "our common historical destiny" and "our final common

goal", implying and stressing in this way the special connections between peoples of the same ethnic origin. It is not the first time that the Khrushchev group, departing from the Marxist-Leninist class position, has tried to build its political platform regarding the relations between states and Parties on such ethnic, racial and even religious grounds, going so far as to make one effort after another to get closer to the Pontiff of Rome in order to win the support of Catholics. But to replace the class principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism with pan-Slavism or with other similar non-Marxist ideas means to undermine the very basis of international solidarity and unity, and of the relations among the peoples of the socialist countries and the Communist and Workers' Parties. It means to vitiate and damage the cause of socialism. This is one of the many proofs that point to the ultimate and hopeless ideological degeneration of the Khrushchev group.

Khrushchev did not even fail to assign a special, if not a decisive, role to Yugoslavia in the Balkans and even in the world.

It was for this purpose that in his speech at Velenja he extolled in a one-sided way

the fight of the Yugoslav peoples against the fascist invaders by deliberately belittling the great contribution of the other Balkan peoples in the anti-fascist war. Of course, the peoples of Yugoslavia waged a really heroic war for the liberation of their country, but the other Balkan peoples also shed a lot of blood in that war. But by setting one people against another and lavishing biased praises on the struggle of one people and deliberately ignoring the contribution and struggle of other peoples, Khrushchev reveals once again his divisive and provocative aim which is to incite the nationalist and chauvinist passions of the friends he supports. Khrushchev took this occasion to fondle Tito's old dream of a special role in the Balkans for his hegemony in a type of "Balkan federation". During this visit Khrushchev's political and moral Machiavellism came out in all its nakedness.

Khrushchev and Tito puffed themselves up by posing as lords over the destiny of the Balkans. When a foreign journalist asked them at Brioni about this matter, observers could not help but notice Khrushchev's annoyance in his retort: "Why do you stick your nose into our internal affairs?" Just

what lies hidden behind the phrase "our internal affairs" was brought to light by the British news agency Reuter, which wrote on August 18: "The possibility of new Balkan projects, whereby Yugoslavia would play a primary role, is not to be excluded." The peoples of the Balkans are justified in asking: Since when have Balkan affairs become Khrushchev's and Tito's "internal affair"? Who gave them the exclusive right to speak and act in the name of the Balkan peoples, to bargain and distribute roles behind their back and to their disadvantage?

But who are the Tito clique to which Khrushchev intends "to trust the destiny of the Balkans"? And what is the "special role" which Khrushchev has assigned to them? Our people as well as other Balkan peoples, particularly those of the socialist countries, are very well acquainted with the features of this band of renegades and agents of imperialism; we are well aware of their intentions and role. Are we perhaps to forget the active role of the Tito clique in the Hungarian counter-revolution? Can it be that the subversive activity and plots of the Yugoslav revisionist agents, which have now and then been detected and exposed in

Hungary, Bulgaria, Albania and Rumania have been so soon forgotten? The Albanian people will never forget Koçi Xoxe and Co's betrayal and plot against the sovereignty of our country, which was hatched by the Yugoslav revisionists in collaboration with the Greek fascist monarchists, the U.S. 6th Fleet and a handful of Albanian traitors; nor will they forget the numerous acts of provocation and hostility against the People's Republic of Albania and our people. Well, the Tito clique have in no way given up this type of action, and have changed none of their criminal intentions and methods. And it is precisely for these agents of imperialism, this "Trojan horse", that Khrushchev has opened the door so that they can penetrate into the socialist camp, act against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries in Europe, as well as against the socialist countries in the Balkans.

During his recent visit to Yugoslavia, Khrushchev coordinated his line of action against all the socialist countries with the renegade Tito. This was also evident in the provocative attitude of Khrushchev and the Yugoslav revisionist leaders towards our country. Tito accompanied his "dear friend"

to the northern borders of our Fatherland in a demonstrative way. Khrushchev did not come to Titograd to pay a "cursory" visit to the ethnographic museum of Cettigne and see the relics of Nyegosh. He made a tour of inspection along the Albanian-Yugoslav border, in order to express his support for and approval of the deep-seated hostile stand and intentions of the Yugoslav revisionist leaders against our people, and their notorious encroachment on the freedom and independence of our socialist Fatherland.

It is clear that "the special role" of Titoite Yugoslavia in the Balkans, and even in the world (!), is directed against the vital interests of the socialist camp and the international communist movement; that its aim is to undermine and split them; and that it is a component part of the campaign of the Khrushchev-Tito revisionist united front against those fraternal Parties which firmly uphold the principles of Marxism-Leninism, first and foremost, the Communist Party of China and the Party of Labour of Albania. This is best borne out by the fact that Khrushchev's entire visit to Yugoslavia was accompanied by a frenzied campaign of monstrous, coordinated attacks launched by

Khrushchev and Tito and others against Marxist-Leninist parties.

* * *

The third main conclusion drawn from Khrushchev's visit to Yugoslavia is that he has moved closer to the imperialists, particularly to the U.S. imperialists.

The fact is publicly known — and Tito has more than once confirmed it by his own words — that "socialist" Yugoslavia has been turned into a "bridge between the East and the West". Khrushchev is now openly using this "bridge" not only to get closer but actually to cross over to the West.

The establishment of a direct line of telephone communication between the Kremlin and the White House was recently inaugurated. This line is called "the hot line", through which Khrushchev may talk directly to Kennedy and carry on further negotiations at the expense of the peoples. But Khrushchev and Kennedy also have a living telephone "line", Tito, who provides good service in a "creative way" to their common purpose.

Expressing his great satisfaction with the conclusion of the tripartite Moscow treaty,

which is another capitulation of the Khrushchev group to the imperialists, a fraud and betrayal of the cause of socialism, Tito said in his speech at the banquet given by Khrushchev on August 21, "This is of course still too little. There is much yet to be done. . . ." Tito, the inveterate agent of imperialism, is not satisfied with the results attained so far, he wants further steps to be taken along the road which he clearly pointed out long ago to his revisionist colleagues. This is the road leading to the "economic and political integration of the world", in other words, the road towards the gradual and peaceful integration of socialism into capitalism to which Kennedy has also referred.

Analyzing Khrushchev's public utterances in Yugoslavia, everybody notices that he not only refrained from attacking U.S. imperialism openly but not once did he even refer to it by name. He confined himself to the usual terms of the revisionists regarding "the most aggressive circles of imperialism", which he mentioned only on rare occasions. The AFP news agency pointed out, "This moderation of speech may be explained, of course, by Khrushchev's desire to

maintain the tone of 'peaceful coexistence'. and also to avoid placing the Yugoslavs in an embarrassing position with regards to Washington." But this is not all. Khrushchev never launched an open attack against the imperialists, because his views regarding imperialism in general and U.S. imperialism in particular are the same as those of Tito's, and because he has now proceeded along the road to full reconciliation and rapprochement with the imperialists. Western observers pointed out on this occasion, quite correctly, that pending the decision of the U.S. Congress on the re-establishment of the "most favored nation" clause in trade relations with Yugoslavia, Tito will have something to report and bring as compensation to President Kennedy at the White House on the occasion of his proposed trip to America, that is, Khrushchev's newer and more moderate attitude.

The attitude of the Tito clique towards U.S. imperialism is no secret to anyone nor is the attitude of U.S. imperialism towards the Tito clique. Their relations are like those of master and servant. It is clear that by lining up and joining with the servant and agent of imperialism, who is being

nourished and kept on his feet by American dollars, Khrushchev is taking a big step towards approaching and joining with his master — U.S. imperialism. Everybody sees this. They see and condemn this open betrayal of Khrushchev who, by fraternizing with Tito, is spreading the carpet for the day not so far away when the imperialists and revisionists will celebrate Khrushchev's complete rapprochement with John Kennedy. Facts are now so clear that even those who have for some time habitually followed Khrushchev in his great betrayal can now see it. A truly great responsibility towards their Parties, their peoples and the international communist movement falls on those leaders who have had and still have reservations about Tito particularly, and about what Khrushchev and Tito are doing, and yet who keep silent, are afraid to say what they think and dare not express their opinion. Friendship with Tito leads to friendship with Kennedy as well. Are all those leaders who call themselves Communists but who keep silent in favor of this, too? The Khrushchev group is trying to persuade the communists and people that unity with Titoite Yugoslavia means unity

with socialist and anti-imperialist forces and serves the interests of the socialist camp and the international communist movement.

In order to judge whether this union really has such a character or not, let us look at how the West reacted to Khrushchev's visit to Yugoslavia and whether the capitalist world was perturbed by Belgrade's "new approach" to Moscow.

Facts show that far from being disconcerted, the West and the imperialist powers were pleased with and hailed this visit. In one of its reports from Belgrade, the *Washington Post* said, "Western diplomats are pleased with the tone and results of the talks between Tito and Khrushchev." Therefore, instead of suspending its loans to Tito for its "rapprochement with Moscow", Washington is taking steps to increase them.

This fact alone suffices to prove how false Khrushchev's demagogic claim is that unity with Tito means unity with the socialist and anti-imperialist forces. If it were so, if the sharp edge of this unity were directed against imperialism, then from the imperialists we would not hear praise and congratulations for the Yugoslav road and the rapprochement of the Tito clique with

Khrushchev, but we would hear the same anti-socialist and counter-revolutionary attacks which the imperialists usually launch against their class enemy — the proletariat and its Marxist-Leninist parties and against the socialist and anti-imperialist forces in the world.

It is not difficult to understand from this who will benefit from such rapprochement and unity. The imperialists have good reasons to welcome and support this rapprochement and unity, because in it they see the establishment of the revisionist united front against socialism and all forces of the world revolutionary, anti-imperialist movement.

It is noticeable that Khrushchev's visit to Yugoslavia ended with no big rally in Belgrade or final statement or communiqué. This is by no means casual, for Khrushchev and Tito themselves stressed more than once that, although it was officially announced that Khrushchev went to Yugoslavia for a period of rest, this visit was a business one. In reality, under these circumstances, only business could be the outcome of the Tito-Khrushchev talks. Such is in fact the out-

come of a conspiracy of plotters who are trying to hush up their crimes.

Both Tito and Khrushchev are fond of making a noise. They would have liked publicly to announce their full unity, but their career demanded restraint lest they should expose their plans and damage their position.

Tito, of course, was eager to have a rally held and official documents published, for that would officially put an end to the Moscow Statement, rehabilitate him completely, grant legal status to the "special" socialism of Yugoslavia, finally include the League of Yugoslav Communists within the ranks of the international communist movement as a "Marxist-Leninist party" and sanction at the same time their joint views on present world developments and problems of the international communist movement. In other words, Tito would have liked everything Khrushchev said in secret talks and in public speeches in favor of the Yugoslav leaders and their common ideas to be proclaimed in a joint official document.

But Khrushchev feels obliged to maintain his mask for a while because however carefully a joint official document was drawn

up, it would still be contrary to the Moscow Statement. Khrushchev is obliged to resort to manoeuvring and deceit by still swearing by the Moscow Statement. He reckons that the work is done, that is, Tito has been rehabilitated, the Moscow Statement has been violated, his activities have been coordinated with those of the Yugoslav revisionists and they hatched up plots together, yet all these things have been done without being sanctioned by any official document, which would provide Marxist-Leninists with more weapons.

Tito's dissatisfaction with this was clearly noticed in his farewell speech at the airport. While Khrushchev confined his speech to generalities, Tito defined specifically the results of his guest's visit and talks, enumerated the points they had agreed upon and did it in such a way as to leave no doubt that he intended to remind his friend and not let him forget the pledges he had given during this trip.

These are the main results of Khrushchev's visit to Yugoslavia and of his talks with the Tito clique there.

The whole world is becoming more and more convinced that by his policy of

fraternizing with the Belgrade renegades and his rapprochement with the imperialists, Khrushchev is betraying the Soviet people and the other peoples of the socialist countries, the international communist movement and the national-liberation and anti-imperialist struggle of the peoples of the world. Khrushchev had the audacity to say at Brioni, "I have much to be proud of!" Yes, indeed, Khrushchev has much "to be proud of". He may boast that he is carrying out the aims of the frenzied class enemies of socialism and of the Soviet Union, he may boast that he is seriously endangering the achievements of the Great October Socialist Revolution, that he is wrecking the socialist camp and splitting the international communist movement for the benefit of international reaction and U.S. imperialism.

But the peoples and history will not forget, nor will they forgive him. The Soviet people have come triumphantly through many grave trials in their life. Their Communist Party and all peoples, Communists and revolutionaries of the world will never forgive Khrushchev for his high treason against Marxism-Leninism and the inter-

national working class, against all peoples, socialism and peace.

Maintaining their revolutionary vigilance, and keeping up the spirit of proletarian internationalism and unbounded loyalty to Marxism-Leninism, and the interests of the proletariat and of the people, true Marxist-Leninists and revolutionaries will fight selflessly and with determination against modern revisionism, imperialism and reaction, to defend the purity of Leninist teachings and strive for the triumph of socialism, communism and peace in the world.